

REMARKS

This communication is in response to the Office Action mailed September 28, 2006. In the Office Action, claims 1 and 3-9 are finally rejected as being unpatentable over Maroulis in view of Ford and Dekelbaum. Claims 2 and 10-11 are finally rejected as being unpatentable over Maroulis in view of Ford and Dekelbaum, and additionally in view of Rogers.

In response to the Office Action, Applicant has amended the independent claims to recite enterprise wide directory information is integrated into the operation of the CTI control mechanism with respect to a particular user, wherein the enterprise wide directory is a directory of named objects, including users, network devices and network services. See, for example, [0085] and [0086] of the published version of Applicant's patent application as support for this amendment.

The independent claims now recite that the user CTI control mechanism has "an interface via which each of a plurality of particular users can configure a CTI application to logically associate a computer and a gateway telephone in physical proximity to the computer with the telephonic identity of that particular user." Dependent claims 12-15 have been added to recite additional features of the "interface."

None of Maroulis, Ford or Dekelbaum recite that enterprise wide directory information is integrated into the operation of the CTI control mechanism with respect to a particular user, wherein the enterprise wide directory is a directory of named objects, including users, network devices and network services. For example, the "computer telephone application" cited by the Examiner in Dekelbaum does not have enterprise wide directory information integrated into its operation. In fact, the Dekelbaum "computer telephone application" does not even appear to one that can be configured "to logically associate a computer and a gateway telephone in physical proximity to the computer with the telephonic identity of that particular user."

The "gateway database" (database 54, in Fig. 2) cited as being disclosed by Ford provides call routing information, but the database 54 is not an "enterprise wide directory" that "is a directory of named objects, including users, network devices and network services."

Rogers is further relied on, in rejecting claims 2 and 10-11. The various "database" blocks disclosed by Rogers are not, however, an "enterprise wide directory" that "is a directory of named objects, including users, network devices and network services."

In summary, then, none of the references relied upon by the Examiner disclose or suggest that enterprise wide directory information is integrated into the operation of a CTI control mechanism with respect to a particular user, wherein the enterprise wide directory is a directory of named objects, including users, network devices and network services. In addition, none of the references relied upon by the Examiner disclose or suggest that enterprise wide directory information is integrated into the operation of the CTI control mechanism with respect to a particular user, wherein the enterprise wide directory is a directory of named objects, including users, network devices and network services.

CONCLUSION

Applicants' believe that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully request a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER LLP

/ASH/
Alan S. Hodes
Reg. No. 38,185

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
408-255-8001